

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 28, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Office of the Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

O God, we pray;

Grant Your mighty aid to the efforts of people everywhere in their continued struggle to establish peace in Your world.

May Your protective care be upon all who risk their own lives and safety on behalf of others.

Give strength of purpose to those who lead.

Enlighten all who sit in council; especially we pray for those who gather in this Chamber.

Transform the hearts of people by Your gracious will, that we may be able to—

Exalt peace over war;

Service over glory;

Justice over gain; and

Righteousness over expediency.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARRETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 25, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 10:05 a.m. on Friday, January 25, 1991, the following message from the Secretary of the Senate: That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3, H.R. 4, and H. Con. Res. 46; that the Senate passed

S. Con. Res. 4, S. Con. Res. 5, and S. Con. Res. 6; and that the Senate made appointments to the Interparliamentary Union and the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Friday, January 25, 1991:

H.R. 3. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise, effective as of January 1, 1991, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans; and

H.R. 4. An act to extend the time for performing certain acts under the Internal Revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield Operations.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-642, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. SKELTON of Missouri, and
Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99-498, the Chair appoints to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. KILDEE of Michigan; and
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of

Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. YATES of Illinois;
Mr. WILSON of Texas; and
Mr. MCDADE of Pennsylvania.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC,
January 24, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Following is my selection for appointment to the House of Representatives Page Board:

Representative Bill Emerson (MO).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377, the Chair appoints as members of the House of Representatives Page Board the following Members of the House:

Mr. KILDEE of Michigan; and
Mr. TOWNS of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 42 and 43, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi;
Mr. MINETA of California; and
Mr. CONTE of Massachusetts.

BOLSTER PEACE EFFORTS IN EL SALVADOR

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, while our service men and women are fighting a war halfway across the globe, it's important to note that another battle is raging closer to home.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Our current focus on the Persian Gulf shouldn't distract us from the need to find a peaceful solution to the war in El Salvador.

The fact that Salvadoran rebels recently murdered several of our soldiers after their helicopter crashed should remind us of the need to resolve this conflict.

Last year, we acted wisely by cutting military aid to the Salvadoran Government after its troops were implicated in the murder of Jesuit priests.

Now the time has come for our diplomats to pressure the Salvadoran rebel leaders to move toward peace.

We can bolster this cause by urging the Government of Nicaragua to put an end to all arms traffic bound for El Salvador.

If we act on these issues today, I pray that we can avoid further bloodshed tomorrow.

□ 1210

CONDEMNING THE TREATMENT OF ALLIED POW'S

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House POW/MIA Task Force, I want to follow up on the resolution we unanimously passed last week with my strong support condemning the inhumane treatment of American and other allied prisoners by the Iraqis. POW's are guaranteed certain rights under the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war to which Iraq acceded in 1956. Iraq has violated this convention through physical mistreatment and torture, public exhibition, elicitation of political statements, and the use of POW's as human shields. These brutal actions only further underscore the terroristic nature of Saddam's dictatorship as already witnessed by the rape of Kuwait, the use of chemical weapons against both Iranian and Iraqi citizens, the Scud attacks against Israeli and Saudi cities, and the deliberate polluting of the Persian Gulf with millions of gallons of oil. We must continue to hold Iraq 100 percent responsible for the treatment of our brave fliers.

Just as Presidents Reagan and Bush have made the fullest possible accounting of the 2,285 Americans still prisoner and missing in action in Southeast Asia one of this Nation's highest national priorities, so too must the timely repatriation and fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIA's in the Persian Gulf. A key lesson of the Vietnam war is that we must never forget our POW/MIA's or their families. I believe we've learned that lesson and will continue to undertake every positive effort to bring our POW/MIA's

home from Iraq and Indochina as soon as possible. We will not repeat the POW/MIA tragedy of the Vietnam war.

ALLIES SHOULD PAY PRO RATA SHARE OF DESERT STORM

(Mr. HUTTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Jim Baker is to be commended on his efforts to get our allies to help foot the bill on conducting Desert Storm operations against Iraq. It's now reported that several nations have pledged additional funds—Japan \$9 billion, Kuwait \$13.5 billion, and Germany \$1 billion. Some of these nations have been willing to help in various other ways, such as committing a token number of troops and providing in-kind services. But, Mr. Speaker, these nations and others are benefiting greatly from the sacrifices being made by our forces in the Persian Gulf. We are directly defending Kuwait and Saudi Arabia—and Japan and Germany are heavily dependent on oil from the Persian Gulf. We have a tremendous deficit to deal with in America and these allies and others should be paying most of the costs of this war. They can afford it. I hope that Secretary Baker will continue to insist that they pay a pro rata share of this burden.

SADDAM HUSSEIN, A SENSELESS MONSTER

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the latest horrifying development in the Middle East is Saddam Hussein's pumping of hundreds of millions of barrels of crude oil into the Persian Gulf. From the latest reports, this action has created an oil slick 35 miles long and 10 miles wide.

This is a truly mournful development. It demonstrates Saddam's lack of regard for the world around him, and to me this speaks volumes about what kind of a senseless monster he is.

There is no reasoning that can rationalize this action, not even as a so-called scorch the Earth battle technique.

To dump this tremendous volume of oil into the Persian Gulf is merely a thumb in the nose at allied military forces in the region, but may be gravely disastrous for the water supplies and fragile ecosystems of the Persian Gulf region and beyond.

This action removes any doubt about the menace this man presents to the world. He gasses his own people; he murders his opposition; he gobbles up his peaceful neighbors; he fouls the air, and now he pollutes the water.

He has stockpiled the deadliest chemicals known to man, and has no remorse for accumulating the capability to spread deadly diseases all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt Saddam Hussein is a grave threat to the security of the world, and I pray that we can end his reign of terror swiftly and decisively.

SOLID WASTE: A PROBLEM IN KENTUCKY AND IN AMERICA

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me, and I think for all my colleagues in the House and in the other body, to speak today about anything other than the war and the troops there in Desert Storm and about their safety, and we hope their speedy return.

It is always difficult to shift from the sublime, problems of war and peace, life and death, to the mundane, which is what I address today—garbage and garbage disposal and the reduction of the waste stream in America.

But garbage, solid waste, is a major, major problem. It is a problem nationally. It is a problem in Kentucky. The General Assembly even today is meeting trying to find ways that Kentucky as a State can handle what we generate within our borders and perhaps accept garbage and waste from outside our borders.

In the 101st Congress, Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation that would have established a White House Conference on Solid Waste Reduction and Disposal. It was not completed. I have reintroduced that legislation in the 102d Congress, Mr. Speaker. I invite all my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I think if there were a national forum, a conference of that nature, we would be able to deal with this very serious problem with the coherence and comprehension it demands.

ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER IN THE GULF

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, we do not have a phrase in our language to describe scorched earth as it applies to the sea. Maybe "suffocation of the sea" fits. A few dead birds and fish in an oily grave would not normally catch our eyes as anything particularly outrageous at a time when we are at war, but this time in the Persian Gulf we apparently are looking at a deliberately engineered environmental catastrophe.

It seems it was not enough for Saddam Hussein to flaunt his diabolical treatment of American hostages. Now in desperation he screams obscenity at the entire world, taking the region's environment hostage.

This would not be the first time this brutal man has placed the ecosystem of the gulf at risk. In fact, he did it during the Iran-Iraq War. This slick dwarfs the *Erion Valdez* disaster and will deplete in massive numbers the marine life in that region.

I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] for his resolution to make Saddam Hussein responsible for the heinous crimes he has committed against captured military personnel. I support such a measure and urge my colleagues to take it one step further. There must also be accountability for this latest crime against the environment.

When the time comes to address reparations, we must make Saddam Hussein pay for the toll he has taken on the environment.

RAISING "CERTAIN PLACES" PAY FOR TROOPS IN OPERATION DESERT STORM

(Mr. MCCURDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that will raise the 1949 pay levels for our troops in Operation Desert Storm.

I am quite concerned that our soldiers, standing in harm's way in the Persian Gulf, receive the token supplement known as "certain places pay" at levels set in 1949. An enlisted person participating in Operation Desert Storm gets between \$8 and \$22.50 per month over base pay. This legislation will raise this special pay to a flat payment of \$80 per month, regardless of rank, and will expand the entitlement to the officer corps.

"Certain places" pay is granted at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense to service members who are posted outside the continental United States in areas that are hostile or otherwise remote or inhospitable.

Mr. Speaker, members of the armed services worldwide, especially those involved in Desert Storm, should be more equitably compensated for the rigors of duty overseas. In the era of an All-Volunteer Force, our officers, who have historically been excluded because of their volunteer status, should receive this pay, as well. This bill will grant back pay to service men and women involved in Desert Shield and Desert Storm from the date they entered the theater.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to raise the level of support for our Armed Forces serving in arduous conditions worldwide.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING ACT OF 1991

(Mr. BROWN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, high-performance computing is one high-technology field in which America is still generally regarded as a world leader. However, because of its importance as a tool in scientific and engineering research and as a productivity enhancer in many commercial applications, high-performance computing has been targeted for vigorous development by our Japanese and European economic competitors. Unless decisive steps are taken to ensure our continued leadership, America may once again be left in the dust in a technology field which we largely pioneered and which is important to our economic future.

The pace of technological change in high-performance computing is rapid. To remain at the leading-edge requires strong support for pioneering research in new computer hardware, software and network technology, as well as expansion of the human resource base in computer and computational sciences. These goals can be met only through coordinated and collaborative research and development activities among industry, Government, and academe.

The proposed legislation introduced today in the House and Senate will ensure that such a coordinated research program begins to move forward. The bill builds on a structure for planning and coordination that has begun to be put in place by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy [OSTP]. The bill calls on OSTP to develop a 5-year plan for a balanced, interagency R&D program to address all of the key areas that will guarantee progress. In particular the bill will establish a high-capacity national research and education network to link Government laboratories, universities, industry and the educational community, broadly. The network will be created with the active cooperation of the computer and telecommunications industries and with the goal of transitioning the management and operation of the network to the commercial sector.

Other parts of the high-performance computer initiative will result in increased Federal research and development focus on scientific computer software, particularly for exploitation of new supercomputer architectures. In addition, the proposed program will encourage development of new generations of supercomputers, including installation of prototype and early production models in Federal labs. Finally, the program will expand Federal support for basic research in computer and computational sciences with the

associated goal of training more scientists and engineers in these fields.

It is becoming widely recognized that many fields of science and technology now require high performance computing and the existence of a national, high-capacity computer network in order for advancements to be made. These are sometimes referred to as grand challenges and include such diverse fields as: Modeling and forecasting weather, and global climate changes; computational fluid dynamics applied to the design of hypersonic aircraft or efficient automobile bodies, and to the recovery of oil; structural calculations applied to increased understanding and design of pharmaceuticals, chemical catalysts, semiconductors, and superconductors; plasma dynamics for development of fusion energy technology and safe military technology; and mapping the structure of the human genome.

High performance computing is truly an enabling technology which is changing the way science and engineering is done and which will be crucial for any society to be competitive in the 21st century. It is no surprise that Europe and Japan have targeted information technologies for particular attention. The investment needed to reach the goals of the high performance computing program seems small relative to the possible returns to our society. Even in a period of fiscal constraint, we must not fail to invest in the science base in key fields of technology that will be critical for sustaining our future economic growth.

□ 1220

PERSIAN GULF WAR COST-SHARING ACT

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the most important costs of the war in the Persian Gulf are the costs in human lives.

And we pray for the safety of our American troops serving in the gulf today, and the innocent civilians caught in the war.

But there is another cost, too. When the war is over, the enormous financial costs will have to be paid.

And who is going to end up paying the bill?

If history is our guide, our allies will want to charge it to the American taxpayers.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 92) that will require the President to negotiate offset payments from our allies to cover most costs of the war in the Persian Gulf. My bill mandates cost-sharing agreements which the President

must negotiate by July 1 with our allies.

Under terms of the Persian Gulf War Cost-Sharing Act, "Japan should bear 25 percent of the cost of the war; Germany 15 percent; the Saudi's and the Kuwaitis 50 percent. If these countries fail to agree to make payments to meet these shares, then tariffs will be imposed on the import of all goods from these countries to the United States to raise the money necessary to cover their specified contribution to this war.

It is time for our allies to pay up. No longer can American borrow money from our allies to turn around and pay for their defense. In the case of the war in the Persian Gulf, many of our allies are much more dependent on Persian Gulf oil than the United States.

If there truly is a new world order, let's impose that new order on the enforcement on the cost of the Persian Gulf war. It is no longer acceptable to have Uncle Sam bear the burden, carry the load, and pay the price while most of our allies sit on the sidelines bleachers as cheerleaders.

I am submitting the text of my bill to appear after my remarks.

H.J. Res. 92

Whereas the United Nations has condemned the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq and authorized member states to use all means necessary, as part of a multinational effort, to secure the withdrawal of Iraq;

Whereas a multinational coalition has initiated military action against Iraq to bring about an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait;

Whereas the equitable sharing of the costs of the Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm is essential to the success of the war against Iraq;

Whereas the costs of Operation Desert Storm are estimated to be as high as \$30 billion per month;

Whereas the military forces currently fighting Iraq are supported primarily with United States tax dollars;

Whereas the economic security of many nations is much more dependent on the success of Operation Desert Storm than is the economic security of the United States; and

Whereas many wealthy allied nations, particularly Japan and Germany, have not made proportional financial contributions to Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Persian Gulf War Cost-Sharing Resolution".

SEC. 2. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL IMPORT DUTIES ON PRODUCTS OF COUNTRIES NOT ENTERING INTO COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS OR THAT FAIL TO MEET OBLIGATIONS UNDER COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Any duty imposed on any article under the authority of this section is in addition to any other duty that is, or may be, imposed on such article.

(2) The duty imposed under subsection (b) or (c) on all articles of any country shall be of a uniform ad valorem rate.

(b) FAILURE TO ENTER INTO MANDATORY COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—

(1) If a country listed in section 3(a) does not enter into a cost-sharing agreement with the United States under section 3 before July 1, 1991, the President shall impose a duty on each article that is a product of that country and is imposed into the United States on or after that date.

(2) The rate of the duty imposed under paragraph (1) shall be calculated so as to result in the collection of revenues equal to the contribution that such country would have been required to make to the United States if a cost-sharing agreement that meets the requirements applicable to that country under section 3 had been entered into.

(c) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH MANDATORY COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—

(1) If the President determines that a country listed in section 3(a) that entered into a cost-sharing agreement with the United States under section 3 is not complying with the terms of the agreement, the President shall impose a duty on each article that is a product of that country and is imported into the United States on and after a date determined by the President (but not later than the 60th day after the date of the determination of noncompliance).

(2) The rate of the duty imposed under paragraph (1) shall be calculated so as to result in the collection of revenues equal to the difference between—

(A) the contribution, if any, made by the country before the determination of noncompliance is made under paragraph (1); and

(B) the contribution that such country was required to make under such agreement before such determination.

(d) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH NONMANDATORY COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—

(1) If the President determines that a country that entered into a cost-sharing agreement with the United States pursuant to section 3(b) is not complying with the terms of the agreement, the President shall impose a duty on one or more articles that are a product of that country and are imported into the United States on and after a date determined by the President (but not later than the 60th day after the date of the determination of noncompliance).

(2) The rate or rates of duty imposed under paragraph (1) shall be calculated so as to—

(A) encourage compliance with the terms of the agreement; or

(B) result in the collection of revenues equal to the difference between—

(1) the contribution, if any, made by the country before the determination of noncompliance is made under paragraph (1), and

(2) the contribution that such country was required to make under such agreement before such determination.

(3) TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF DUTIES.—The President may terminate or suspend—

(1) the duty imposed under subsection (b) or (c) with respect to a country; and

(2) any duty imposed under subsection (d) with respect to a country;

after the President determines, and reports to Congress, that the purpose for which the duty with imposed has been achieved.

SEC. 3. COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.

(a) MANDATORY COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—The President shall promptly undertake consultation for the purpose of entering into a cost-sharing agreement with the government of each of the following countries.

(1) Japan.

(2) Germany.

(3) Saudi Arabia.

(4) Kuwait.

(b) NONMANDATORY COST-SHARING AGREEMENT.—The President shall undertake consultations for the purpose of entering into a cost-sharing agreement with the governments of any country to which subsection (a) does not apply if the President considers that a contribution by such country to the United States for the Gulf War cost incurred by the United States is justified, taking into account—

(1) the economic or security benefit that accrued, or is accruing, to such country as a result of the efforts by the United States to compel the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait; and

(2) The ability of such country to provide a contribution.

(c) DETERMINATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) A cost-sharing agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) with a country shall obligate that country to contribute to the United States, under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreeable, its share, determined under paragraph (2), of the Gulf War costs incurred by the United States.

(2) The contribution which a country obligates itself to provide under a cost-sharing agreement is the product of the Gulf War costs incurred by the United States multiplied by a specified percentage (hereinafter referred to as the "cost-sharing percentage"). The President shall determine the cost-sharing percentage for each country, subject to the following requirement in the case of cost-sharing agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a):

(A) The cost-sharing percentage for Japan may not be less than 20 percent.

(B) The cost-sharing percentage for Germany may not be less than 15 percent.

(C) The agreement of the cost-sharing percentage for the countries listed in subsection (a) (3) and (4) may not be less than 50 percent.

(d) NATURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—Contributions made under agreements entered into under subsections (a) and (b) shall be in the form of money, except to the extent otherwise agreed.

SEC. 4. REPORTS.

(a) WHEN AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO.—The President shall promptly submit to the Congress a report containing a description of each cost-sharing agreement that is entered into under section 3.

(b) PERIODIC IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—The President shall periodically (but not less than quarterly) submit to the Congress a report regarding the implementation of this Act, including—

(1) an assessment of the extent to which the obligations under each agreement entered into under section 3 are being complied with;

(2) with respect to any duties imposed under section 2—

(A) the reason for the imposition; and

(B) the amount of the revenues resulting from the imposition; and

(3) a current estimate of the extent to which the Gulf War costs incurred by the United States have been offset by contributions made under cost-sharing agreements.

SEC. 5. CBO COST ESTIMATES.

The Congressional Budget Office shall—

(1) determine, and from time to time revise, the Gulf War costs incurred by the United States; and

(2) make such determinations and revisions promptly available to the Congress and the Executive branch.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) The phrase "Gulf War costs incurred by the United States" means the direct and indirect costs (as determined under section (5)) to the United States—

(A) in carrying out those military, naval, air, and related operations known as Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, and any successor operations related to compelling the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait; and

(B) in implementing, after the cessation of such operations—

(i) the restoration of vital service in areas of allied countries in the Middle East that suffered damage or destruction,

(ii) the withdrawal of United States military personnel and equipment from the war area; and

(iii) the resettlement of refugees.

(2) The term "imported" means entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

TWO THINGS WE CAN DO TO SUPPORT OUR TROOPS IN THE PERSIAN GULF

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are very supportive of our troops, but they are also very frustrated in what they can do. I think there are two things that we can do to support those in the Persian Gulf.

First of all, give visual and verbal support. I think this is absolutely essential.

Now, I do not take anything away from all these groups who want to protest this; this is fine, it is their constitutional right. But for God's sake, don't burn the flag. Don't desecrate the flag. Hold it up with respect.

If you want to speak against it, speak against it. I think this is very demoralizing to those who are over there putting their lives on the line.

I think this was shown very strongly during the Vietnam conflict.

Second, let us buy American-made products, products that are made in the United States of America. This war is going to be paid for, mostly, in American lives and money. And it is being spent for an effort mostly to benefit Europe and Southeast Asia.

While they will benefit, Americans are going to be continually buried into a deep recession and deep debt and at a tremendous cost of lives.

I think these are two ways that Americans at home can help those troops in the Persian Gulf.

NOSTALGIA MAKES RETURN ENGAGEMENT TO WASHINGTON

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, you probably witnessed as I did that the politics of nostalgia made a return engagement to Washington this past Saturday when some of the adolescent protesters of the 1960's came back to town.

The demonstrators were heartened, no doubt, by the news that somebody by the name of George McGovern is seriously considering yet another run at the Presidency. If he does run in 1992, he will join Harold Stassen of our party as the only other man to seek the Presidency in at least four different decades.

All of this goes to prove that people are not necessarily growing up even though they have birthdays that mark the passage of time.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced a vast majority of the American people are not stuck in a 1960's time warp. The vast majority of the American people watched with horror the genocide in Southeast Asia that followed this so-called giving peace a chance philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the American people know that the national interests of the United States of America must be defended promptly; it must be decisive and, above all, it must be unapologetic.

That is why the American people support Desert Storm.

NEW STRATEGIES TO MEET NEW CHALLENGES—A MARSHALL PLAN FOR AMERICA

(Mr. THORNTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, the great concern which we all share about the war should not divert our attention from preparing for the challenges which will follow the end of this conflict. World events, including the end of the cold war, have afforded us an opportunity for a new beginning.

New strategies are needed to make America the strongest Nation in the world economically, and the greatest in pursuit of human values and freedoms, as well as in the development of the new flexible and mobile defenses needed to protect our national interest.

In our quest for this new beginning, for some months now I have been suggesting that we need a Marshall plan for America. Just as at the end of World War II we rebuilt the crumbling infrastructure of our former enemies and allies, in Europe and in Asia, we need to plan now for our own Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I will be outlining in detail my concept of what this new beginning, a Marshall plan for America, will encompass.

REINTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO PRODUCE A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY AND SUGGESTING LONG-RANGE GOALS FOR SUCH A POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, we need a national energy policy now. It is as important as protecting the oil fields in Saudi Arabia. That is why I am reintroducing, with modifications, a concurrent resolution calling upon President Bush to complete, announce, and seek implementation of a balanced, comprehensive national energy policy, as mandated in the Energy Department Organization Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7321).

As a part of this resolution, I am suggesting a set of long-range numerical objectives against which progress can be measured periodically. It is my hope that these goals can serve as a starting point for discussion of what the objectives in the President's national energy policy should be. I will submit the resolution following my remarks.

In addition, I am recommending the formation of a combined committee on energy to mobilize the Congress in order to decisively address the spectrum of legislative issues that could be raised by the submission of the President's energy initiative.

CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF ENERGY POLICY

Before the 1990-91 events in the Persian Gulf fade from the Nation's television screens and front pages, and oil prices retreat to, or below, \$20 per barrel, it is necessary to remind ourselves why the United States and the other nations of the coalition have deployed military forces in this region for the second time since 1988. As Jessica Mathews of the World Resources Institute wrote over this past weekend: "It has not gone unnoticed abroad that the United States is unable to manage its energy demand." Pointing out that two-thirds of the world's petroleum reserves are in the Persian Gulf Nations, Ms. Mathews urged: "No matter how hard it will be * * * this country must argue its way to a coherent energy policy—if for no other reason than that national security demands it" (Washington-Post, January 20, 1991, page B7).

Another commentator, Michael Schrage of the Los Angeles Times recently observed:

Whether the war with Iraq lasts 6 days or 6 months—and whatever the outcome—it's time for an energy policy that creatively balances exploration, innovation, conservation, and price. * * * America remains too dependent on unreliable sources of foreign oil. If that statement remains true after the Gulf conflict, we may have won the war but we will certainly have lost the peace. ("An Energy Policy Should Be As Important As Our Gulf Policy," Washington Post, January 18, 1991, page f3).

I feel that the American people understand that a long-range energy policy for this country is essential for the sake of national security, U.S. independence, and freedom of action in the world, and our economic stability and environmental quality.

NEEDED: PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Since the Suez Canal was closed in 1956, there have been six major crises in the Middle East that have halted or threatened to halt oil supplies to the rest of the world. That is about one crisis every 6 years. It is apparent that, until we get control of our energy policy in this country, both we and the world will be at the mercy of every crisis that comes along.

The crisis of 1990-91 is not a surprise. What is surprising and unfortunate—is that the United States does not have a policy to deal with it, other than military policy. It will be a national tragedy if we are in the same position the next time.

A DIVISION OF LABOR BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

The 1977 act wisely places the responsibility of developing and coordinating national energy policy with the President. This law requires President Bush to produce a long-range energy policy around which all of us can rally. As the latest in a series of Washington Post editorials confirmed last week: "Little will happen (in energy policy) until an administration leads the way" ("Needed, An Energy Strategy * * *," January 18, 1991, page A20).

Congress owes the President its best advice and counsel, its best constructive efforts in creating consensus and in implementing recommendations through legislation and continuing oversight. Some Members are in a position to offer advice on the basis of their work in this body. I took the liberty of doing so following my subcommittee's hearing on August 7, 1990, by way of a letter to the President recommending four measures to damp down oil prices increases in the aftermath of the invasion of Kuwait.

Today's resolution, and the suggestion of a combined congressional committee represent my best thinking as to the national energy policy effort. As I have said many times before I pledge my future efforts to assist further in this process in whatever way I can.

HISTORY OF THIS ENERGY POLICY RESOLUTION

The predecessor of today's resolution (H. Con. Res. 389) was introduced on October 26, 1990 (see "interim report on subcommittee investigation and sense of Congress resolution that the President complete a national energy policy," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 26, 1990, page E3461). The prior resolution proposed a target date for the President's policy of December 31, 1990. It attracted 10 cosponsors before the resolution expired with the adjournment of the 101st Congress. Obviously, the original resolution is outdated, be-

cause no Presidential energy policy was announced before December 31—or since.

As a consequence, the target date of the new resolution has been postponed until April 1, 1991. The rationale is twofold: this date conforms with the reporting date of the statute. It also gives the President ample time to dispose of urgent business in the Middle East, and to resolve the varying opinions within his administration, so that his policy can be appropriately integrated. If the Bush administration is able to make this deadline, it will be exactly 2 years overdue in complying with the 1977 statute.

ENERGY VISION FOR THE YEAR 2000

My revised resolution also adds something else. According to the 1977 law, the national energy policy plan should contain overall 5- and 10-year energy objectives. Pursuant to these objectives, the strategies, resources, research, and regulatory changes that are needed to achieve these long-term goals are to be identified. The statute thus establishes a thoughtful and orderly management process for the Nation's energy problems.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "POLICY" AND "STRATEGY"

Those concerned with energy policy in the Congress and the private sector have seen little evidence that the Presidential effort is seriously addressing the question of what the 5-year and 10-year goals of national energy policy should be.

For example, the Presidential effort is designated as a national energy strategy initiative, even though the 1977 law assigns strategy a role that is subordinate to long-term objectives.

Also, the so-called "interim report" on national energy strategy issued by the Department of Energy in April 1990 is really only a listing of options offered by witnesses. It does not include a synthesis of options, any analysis, independent research, or policy recommendations.

Frankly, I am concerned that the President's elaborate procedures may be short-circuiting the basic policy process envisioned by the 1977 law. In my opinion, strategies, work plans, and timetables, no matter how detailed, are useless unless the objectives to which they are directed are valid. I am therefore asking the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service to assess the extent of compliance, or noncompliance, with the 1977 statute and give us their independent judgment as to the implications of any Presidential departure from statutory provisions, so that Congress may pursue its appropriate legislative and oversight responsibilities.

To assist further, the new resolution suggests my own set of long-term 5- and 10-year national energy policy goals for the year 2000, based upon the work of the Subcommittee on Eco-

nomics Stabilization under my chairmanship. As the cover story in *Fortune* magazine recently stated: "This country is a hostage to the unpredictable politics of a region that is a perpetual powderkeg. What we need is a clearer vision of where we go from here. * * * All those calls we keep hearing for an energy policy numb the ears, but they are right." The long-term objectives summarized below set forth my vision of what national energy policy should achieve 10 years from now.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN UMBRELLA CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

A vital element in national energy policy is the cooperation of Congress with the President in such areas as consensus-building, legislation, and oversight.

I am certainly not the leading energy expert in the House. Many of my colleagues in this body have worked hard and accomplished much in this field over many years.

As one of many examples, this past Congress, under the leadership of the House Energy Committee, expanded the authorization for the strategic petroleum reserve to 1 billion barrels.

My subcommittee happened to be concerned with the subjects of national energy security and economic stability as part of its responsibility of reauthorizing and modernizing the Defense Production Act, so that our defense industrial base would not run out of energy during times of emergency.

From the time of the reflagging operation in the Persian Gulf in 1988 to the launching of operation Desert Storm, our subcommittee has devoted 12 days of public hearings and extensive research to questions of energy security and related problems of adequacy of supply for civilian industry, assuring these supplies at reasonable prices and compatible with environmental quality and overall economic stability.

Witnesses before our subcommittee on December 11, 1990, noted that about 10 committees and an equal number of subcommittees of Congress have jurisdiction over various aspects of energy policy—such as environment, exploration, taxation, housing, foreign affairs, and so forth. My view is that, until the current crisis of oil dependence is under control, it would be helpful to the country to have a coordination of congressional effort. As a counterpart to the 1977 statutory Presidential assignment to coordinate the executive branch effort.

There is a precedent for such a body. In 1978, during my early years in Congress, an ad hoc subcommittee of the House Banking Committee, under the able and dedicated leadership of Representative Lud Ashley of Ohio, laid the basis for enactment of the Energy Security Act of 1980 as part of the Defense Production Act.

Because of the seriousness of the oil crisis decade we find ourselves in, I

would propose that our new committee extend to the various principal areas of energy policy that, in the opinion of the Speaker, need to be coordinated. It would be natural for my knowledgeable and experienced colleagues in the energy area to also take the lead in such an endeavor.

In a short time, I will be formalizing this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE STUDY OF ENERGY SECURITY

My subcommittee's research of the past 2 years has led me to the following conclusions:

It is the responsibility of the President to establish national energy policy, as required by statute. The persuasive legal, functional, political, and practical reasons for this division of labor were explained in my October 26 remarks.

We are now in an energy crisis decade because we have just experienced an energy lost decade, during which there was no adequate policy for reducing this country's dependence on imported petroleum, even though President Reagan found that an import level of 38.1 percent imperiled the national security.

Recent years have been critical, with the level of imports rising from 28 percent of consumption in 1982 and 1983 to between 45 and 50 percent for 1990.

For the past 4 years, there has been no announced energy policy at all.

Witnesses before our subcommittee have suggested that the administration has been relying on an unannounced policy, as declared in an article by David Stockman, of: Strategic reserves and strategic forces—see "The Wrong War? The Case Against A National Energy Policy," Public Interest magazine, fall, 1978. In other words, whatever the price happens to be in world markets on a particular day, U.S. consumers will pay that price. When prices are going down, as they were after 1986, consumers, industry, and business get the benefits. However, this course of action is also risky because the series of economic and political disruptions in the Middle East, where one-fourth of the production and two-thirds of the reserves are located, periodically send prices soaring, and/or imperil the flow of the oil itself, requiring military forces to keep the supply lines open.

One of the implications of pursuing such an unannounced policy is that the costs and risks of the Stockman doctrine have not been publicly scrutinized under the policy process prescribed by the Congress. For example, the General Accounting Office reported that the costs of the 1988 Persian Gulf operation was about \$240 million. We are about to get the bill for the more than 400,000 American service men and women presently engaged in the gulf, and I have requested that the GAO also audit and report to us on that. Even more important is that one of the

prime strengths of a Stockman-like market strategy is that it is impersonal, but that is also its weakness. The market doesn't care whether the United States is secure militarily, politically, or economically.

Five other nations have national energy policies, and they have been helpful in advancing their energy security and economic stability. For example, France, which was once energy poor, now exports energy. Japan has made substantial strides in energy efficiency, to the extent that each American uses 2½ times more energy than each Japanese—"Wasting Opportunities," the Economist magazine, December 22, 1990, page 14.

There is growing consensus that there should be a bona fide comprehensive national energy policy established by the President in this country.

NUMERICAL GOALS AS A FOUNDATION FOR NATIONAL POLICY

I believe that establishment of long-range national energy policy goals, as called for by the 1977 law, has many advantages. Definite targets will allow the country to measure progress, or lack of progress. Our country responds well when we have clear goals before us, such as when President Kennedy challenged the Nation to put a man on the Moon and bring him back again within a decade. The Nation worked together and succeeded in that endeavor. With similar vision and leadership, I believe Americans will work together to secure our long-term energy future.

Setting goals is also good management practice. They will give our Nation a sense of direction and the measurement of performance against these goals will give the Nation the information it needs to make intelligent mid-course corrections in policies, strategies, and their implementation.

Accordingly, following are my candidates for such long-term objectives for the next decade:

ENERGY GOALS FOR THE YEAR 2000

Reduction of oil imports to 35 percent of U.S. consumption. Several experts that appeared before our subcommittee, from different primary energy segments of industry, believe this target is feasible.

Reduction of gasoline use by 30 percent per vehicle/mile. This figure is less than called for by the bill debated in the Senate during the 101st Congress, which we believe is in the neighborhood of 40 percent. There are many farmers in the Midwest and the Great Plains that are now producing import-saving ethanol, and many more could join them if we had an adequate energy policy to encourage them.

Reduction in the amount of electrical energy required to produce household, commercial, and industrial services by 25 percent energy efficiency. This is well within the range of 24 to 44 percent that the Electric Power Research Institute believes is possible.

Reduction of overall U.S. energy intensity by 15 percent. The Department of Energy projects a 1.2-percent reduction per year, or 13 percent by year 2000, in its base case. However, energy intensity declined by more than 2.5 percent per year from 1977 to 1986, so we think we can do a little better than 1.2 percent.

Reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, by 10 percent. The international panel on climate control in Toronto set 20 percent for a goal, but that was only for carbon dioxide. We would extend the target to all greenhouse gases, and would like to assure proper definition so that there would not be double counting from limitations already in effect.

Assuring the availability of electric generating capacity sufficient to accommodate an average of 2.4 percent in real annual growth of gross national product. That is exactly the Department of Energy's base case number.

Increasing the electricity generating reserve capacity to 17 percent nationally and in each region. That is the standard already operative from the North American Electric Reliability Council, which is the body officially charged with electric reliability on this continent. But, the reason this is important is that on the entire Eastern Seaboard, we are now 2 percentage points below minimum safety requirements. This is a prescription for certain blackouts and brownouts during the 1990's.

Improving the U.S. balance of payments position in energy-related products, services, and technology by at least \$10 billion from the 1990 level, with periodic updates based upon the progress of such technologies as clean coal, enhanced exploration and recovery techniques for oil and gas, improved production, transmission, storage, and end-use for electricity, renewable and alternative fuels, shale oil, and others.

Restoration of Federal low- and moderate-income energy assistance and weatherization programs to at least their previous highs. We estimate that the Federal contribution is about \$1 billion below what it was at its peak.

Establishment of a legislative consultative mechanism that assures discussion and coordination of energy and energy-related environmental issues, between decision-level Federal, State, and local officials at least once a year.

In my view, these objectives are realistic and achievable by the year 2000. In fact, I believe, many are quite modest by the standards of what others are proposing. They will promote the overall energy security, adequacy of supply at reasonable prices and environmental quality that both the President and the Congress seek. They have the advantage of not prescribing or mandating or requiring any particular policy or technique to achieve any of the goals. The

choice of means would be entirely up to the President.

This approach has, in my opinion, the overriding advantage of being workable because it leaves the determination of energy policy and its execution where it belongs—in the hands of the President under the Energy Department Organization Act of 1977.

Personally, I would hope that research, development, and demonstration of emerging technologies will play a prominent part in accomplishing many of these goals. American ingenuity has always been America's strong suit. I believe American businesses have led in developing many new technologies, but they have had the rug pulled out from under them by a massive cut in Federal funds devoted to research in nonconventional energy sources since 1980. This amounts to a cut of approximately 90 percent in real terms. That is another liability of the lost energy decade. I hope that next decade will see those funds—and opportunities—more than restored.

THESE GOALS CAN CERTAINLY BE IMPROVED
UPON

I am sure these objectives are not perfect, and other can improve on them. I cordially welcome discussion and refinement of these concepts and numbers.

It is my hope that these proposals will serve as a point of departure for a serious discussion of what should be a critical area of American policy—the 5- and 10-year objectives called for by the Energy Department Organization Act. Even if all my proposals were miraculously incorporated intact into the President's national energy strategy. The ongoing process envisioned by the statute calls for revising them every 2 years as circumstances change.

Mr. Speaker, that is my energy vision for the year 2000. I hope these proposed goals, and the combined congressional committee, will contribute significantly to an improved energy picture for this country by the year 2000 and into the next century. For the sake of our people and for the sake of our country we need a national energy policy now.

A list of the original cosponsors follows:

Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Mr. Wise of West Virginia, Mr. Torres of California, Mr. Kanjorski of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rahall of West Virginia, Mr. Downey of New York, and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

H. CON. RES. 53

Whereas oil import levels in the United States reached 28 percent of total United States oil consumption in 1982 and 1983;

Whereas, when the oil import level in the United States reached 38 percent of total United States oil consumption in 1988, President Reagan declared that such levels threatened to impair the national security;

Whereas oil import levels in the United States for 1990 ranged between 45 and 50 percent of total United States oil consumption,

accompanied by a decline in United States oil production of more than 5 percent;

Whereas oil import levels in the United States are expected to reach 60 percent of total United States oil consumption in 2000 and 65 percent of total United States oil consumption in 2010;

Whereas the current interruption in United States oil importation of 4.3 million barrels per day from Kuwait and Iraq dramatically illustrates the dangers of reliance on imported oil for the security and independence of the United States;

Whereas the current interruption in United States oil importation from Kuwait and Iraq is the 6th energy-related crisis generated by events in the Middle East since 1956;

Whereas section 801 of the Department of Energy Organization Act requires the President to prepare and submit to the Congress a proposed National Energy Policy Plan every 2 years;

Whereas the President has not prepared and submitted to the Congress a proposed National Energy Policy Plan during the 24 months he has been in office;

Whereas research, which holds the potential for realizing many of the Nation's future energy goals, has been reduced by almost 90 percent in real terms during the past decade;

Whereas the President can call upon the resources of the entire Federal Government, including the Department of Energy, to assist him in preparing a proposed National Energy Policy Plan;

Whereas, pursuant to section 801(a)(2) of the Department of Energy Organization Act, the Department of Energy has held 15 public hearings around the United States on the subject of the proposed National Energy Policy Plan; and

Whereas, particularly in view of the current engagement of troops of the United States Armed Forces in the Middle East, the United States needs a proposed National Energy Policy Plan pursuant to which the entire Nation can address important energy issues, and Federal, State, and local governments (and nongovernmental entities, including consumers) can implement appropriate energy-related practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) pursuant to section 801 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7321), the President should prepare and submit to the Congress a proposed National Energy Policy Plan before April 1, 1991, which should be—

(A) balanced and comprehensive, as required by the Act; and

(B) accompanied by implementing documents, such as recommended legislation, regulatory changes, programs, and budget details; and

(2) in considering and establishing national energy objectives for the 10-year period beginning on January 1, 1991, and the strategies and actions necessary to achieve the objectives, the President should consider, as possible national energy goals for the year 2000—

(A) reduction of oil import levels to 35 percent of total United States oil consumption;

(B) reduction in United States gasoline consumption by 30 percent per vehicle/mile;

(C) reduction in the amount of electrical energy required to produce household, commercial, and industrial services (energy efficiency) by 25 percent;

(D) reduction in total United States energy intensity (total energy end use per constant

dollar of the gross national product) by 15 percent;

(E) reduction in total emissions of greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, by 10 percent;

(F) assurance of the availability of sufficient electrical generating capacity to accommodate an average 2.4 percent increase in real annual growth of the gross national product;

(G) an increase in electrical generating reserve capacities of 17 percent, nationally and in each region;

(H) improvement in the United States balance of payments for energy-related products, services, and technology by \$10 billion more than the 1990 balance of payments, with biennial revision of the balance of payments figure based on increased United States technological advancements (in fields such as clean coal, enhanced exploration and recovery techniques for oil and gas, production, transmission, storage, and use of electricity, and renewable and alternative fuels);

(I) restoration of Federal low-income energy and weatherization assistance programs to prior levels; and

(J) a legislated mechanism that ensures annual consultation and coordination among Federal, State, and local governments regarding energy and energy-related environmental issues.

Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article was part of a series written by Thomas Gerdel of the Plain Dealer. I urge my colleagues to read this—it is instructive.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE—U.S. DIGGING FOR
ECONOMICAL AND RENEWABLE FUEL SOURCES
(By Thomas W. Gerdel)

The United States has a wide range of alternatives to oil, ranging from traditional fossil fuels to nuclear power and renewable energy sources.

Finding reasonably priced and environmentally safe replacements for oil will be difficult, however, because of the overwhelming role oil plays in U.S. energy consumption.

Overall, oil accounts for about two-thirds of the energy used in transportation and about 41% of total energy consumption, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the statistical arm of the Department of Energy.

Nuclear power, coal and natural gas combined make up about 54% of the supply. Only about 8% of America's total energy comes from renewable resources.

The major alternatives to oil are:
Nuclear: Nuclear power plants that use uranium as fuel. The United States now has 112 licensed nuclear plants producing about 20% of the nation's total electricity. They provide about 8% of all energy consumed.

There have been no new orders for such plants since 1978.

Coal: Coal-burning plants provide about 55% of the nation's supply of electricity. Coal provides about 23% of all energy consumed.

Coal is burned to generate steam that powers turbines to make electricity. Recently passed federal clean air legislation may force some coal-fired plants to close, but it might also spur increased production of low-sulfur coal, which burns cleaner.

At current production rates, the United States has a 240-year supply of coal.

Natural gas: Natural gas accounts for about 9% of U.S. electric generating capacity. It also provides about 23% of our total national energy needs.

Currently, proven reserves are adequate for *** year supply, but oil experts think there's considerably more out there, particularly in Canada and Alaska.

Renewable resources: Sources including hydroelectric power, solar, wind, geothermal and biomass fuels (fuels from landfills, sewer gas, municipal wastes) account for about 8% of all U.S. energy consumed.

Passive solar systems use sunlight to heat the air or water. In some locations, mirrors are used to concentrate sunlight on a boiler.

Solar photovoltaic cells, made from silicon, convert sunlight directly into electric current. Photovoltaic devices may find more niche markets. In the labs, scientists have been able to double the efficiency of such devices to 35%.

Hydroelectric projects generate about 10% of total electricity consumed.

Advanced forms of windmills can turn turbines to produce electricity. Applications are growing, especially in northern California, near San Francisco.

Some utilities are using geothermal sources to tap heat from underground rocks.

Alcohol fuels: Ethanol, an alcohol produced from crops such as corn or sugar cane, can be mixed with gasoline for use as fuel for autos.

Synthetic fuels: Large quantities of coal and shale are crushed and then processed to produce liquid oil or gas products. The United States has an abundance of coal and shale, and technologies have been developed to produce such fuels.

Current estimates show U.S. coal and oil shale could produce as many as 625 billion barrels of liquid fuel. In contrast, Saudi Arabia's known oil reserves total 160 billion barrels.

But synthetic fuels are not yet deemed economical at current oil prices, mainly because of large capital costs to build such plants. Some coal-gasification plants and one shale oil plant are operating.

The Department of Energy continues to do research at a facility at Wilsonville, Ala., that produces liquid fuels from coal. Research work there has lowered costs from \$90 a barrel to less than \$40 a barrel currently.

ESTIMATED ENERGY CONSUMPTION BY FUEL GROUP

(In quadrillion BTU's)

Fuel	Consumption		Growth (percent) 1990	Market share (in percent)	
	1989	1990		1989	1990
Coal	18.9	18.9	0.	23.3	23.3
Natural gas	19.4	19.4	0.	23.8	23.9
Petroleum	34.2	33.5	-2.1	42.1	41.4
Nuclear	5.7	6.3	10.1	7.0	7.7
Other	3.1	3.0	-2.5	3.8	3.7
Total	81.3	81.1	-2	100.0	100.0

Source: API, DOE.

RETAIL GASOLINE PRICES

Retail motor gasoline prices in selected countries. Taxes included, current exchange rates. Dollars per gallon.

	Jan. 14, 1991
Belgium	\$3.56
France	3.88
Germany	3.05
Italy	4.68
Netherlands	3.74
United Kingdom	3.22
Europe average	3.69
Japan	*3.72
United States	1.22

*As of January 7.
Source: API.

UNITED STATES OIL IMPORTS, 1989

	In percent
Non-OPEC (Canada, Mexico, UK, and others)	48.6
OPEC (non-Mideast)	28.3
OPEC (other-Mideast)	15.5
Iraq	5.6
Kuwait	1.9

Source: Energy Information Administration.

□ 1250

REPORT ON ADVANCED PROGRESS OF UNIFIED EUROPEAN MONETARY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, while Europe continues at an unusually fast and much accelerated pace than what had been anticipated in integrating, we in the United States are disintegrating. Since the announcement at the Bonn, Germany, so-called economic summit meeting of May 1979, at which time our President was Jimmy Carter, the Communiqué that was produced by that conference was short, but it had one last line saying that the conferees agreed in principle to the formation and the development of the European monetary system [EMS] and the European currency unit [ECU].

Very little was reported in our press in the United States about the meaning and significance of that announcement. But I had been aware, because of my reading of the foreign press and foreign financial publications, that since 11 years before, in 1968, and the blueprint announced by the then Luxembourg Financial Minister and the president of the community at that time, which in effect was the basis for the integration of not only an economic but a monetary financial system in a united, or as is known, a single Europe. The target date for single Europe, of course, is next year.

What I want to report to Members today is the advanced progress that is being made in fleshing out and putting in place, and I do believe that the European Community is on the threshold of doing that, of a united European monetary system.

That on its face sounds, I am sure, like it has to so many individuals who might have read about it, as a sort of a surface talk or jargon. But it has everything to do, as I said in August 1979 on this floor, with everything that would mean economic, monetary, and ultimately, of course, fiscal independence for the United States, which means a standard of living in our country.

Unfortunately, there has been little or no discussion in Congress, either in the House or in the Senate, about this. In fact, I would say that between that first special order in August 1979 and the following 10 years, there was only one discussion in the Senate that

touched merely on describing the configuration of what was then coming forth as a European monetary system.

As of last month, December, in a meeting in Europe of the central bankers and the council, because what is very little appreciated in our Congress is that we have had the equivalent of a United States Congress for the European Community. Ever since it was headquartered at Luxembourg, we have had very little, if any, either official or popular, much less popular, knowledge or interest. Yet I cannot think of anything more ominous and threatening to the independence of our Nation, financially and economically, than that.

This is one of the reasons, not the principal reason, but one of the reasons that I am so opposed to our country getting involved in wars, particularly what I would consider unnecessary wars, because it will be the first time that we go to war as a debtor nation.

In the two World Wars, as I have said repeatedly, we were the only creditor nation. But this time we are the most indebted nation in the whole world.

In the meanwhile, things have been permitted to happen almost imperceptibly, by the leadership and the membership of the Congress, by those officials in the executive branch, that I would think would have the prime responsibility to have evaluated, projected, and reported above all in order to inform the people.

How do you inform the people? Well, the best way is by informing the Congress. So that apprehension that I expressed in 1979 was based on the Executive reports that had been written, for instance, in Italy, by the French financial publications, in the, at that time, Federal Republic of Germany's publications, and in the Spanish language press. But nothing in the American press that I could find.

Great Britain, of course, as always, maintaining an independence that it thought it could indulge in, like it has in the past, has since found out that they have got to hook the tail of their international financial kite to at least that band of currency arrangements, and pegged to the deutsche mark, which is the strongest currency right now in the Western financial world.

Even England found it necessary to tie in the pound to the deutsche mark in that so-called second band of currency transactions or relations, or what they call a band.

But actually nothing has really been done in secret. Since the 1968 meeting, at which time, as I said, the Luxembourg official drew a blueprint, the European central bankers and their financial ministers have been very, very adept and very, very capable and very, very successful.

Now, what does this all mean? It means, as I have been saying now for 2 years, that given the instability of the dollar, the erosion of the value of the

dollar now, not less than 55 percent in a matter of less than 6 years, creating instability.

Now, during the wars before when we were a creditor nation, our involvement of our credit was what won the wars, to tell you the truth. What we lost later in between wars, as we have after 1945, we have lost on the money tables, on the financial tables.

Yes, we won the war in the field and in action, but really, the wars are not over. Every one of the wars we have been involved in since 1945, whether they want to be called wars or not, in our books technically they are not wars, any more than our involvement in the gulf today. But everybody knows that it is a war, that we have again set loose this Minotaur to gobble up and devour our youth.

So you lose at the money tables. We did in Vietnam. By the time President Nixon flew in that much publicized trip to China, he had to assure the Chinese of a \$10 million deposit in gold, the equivalent of gold, they did not get boxes of gold and put them in the plane, but they got the equivalent, in order to ensure the defraying of the expenses in China.

□ 1300

Where was that reported? Certainly it was not in the United States, except the statement I made again on the House floor that was picked up by some minor publications.

So where are we today with all of this background? We are on the threshold of the dollar being replaced as the international reserve unit. That sounds like a lot of jargon, but it is not. What that means is that we are the only country whose people have had the great luxury of paying their debts in their own currency. We are the only people that have been that privileged. We are not going to be for long, particularly if we continue to drain the domestic financial markets, not only the indirect but the direct assets as we have, which are now more or less dependent on the vicissitudes, on the things that money men always depend on.

As I said a little while ago, when a country in the midst of a war situation can show the men of money that it is stable, that if they put their money in that country it is going to be taken care of, that is where the money is going to go. We attracted huge reserves. Our country at the time of World War II and later ended up with the biggest gold, so-called reserves ever, and that was soon gone. That is in that enormous amounts. But the reason was that the money was coming here as a safe haven.

The one interesting factor up to now in our involvement in the Middle East, in the so-called gulf war, is that this is not happening now. In fact, we have the opposite. Money is not coming.

If some of our geopoliticians thought that war would be good for that reason, based on the past experiences, I think they have a lot more of a cooler attitude toward that, because it is not happening. In fact, I will include in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 15, which was in the business section entitled "Taiwan Cuts Holdings in U.S. Banks; \$35 Billion Shifted; Recession Fears Are Cited."

Taiwan, holder of one of the world's largest foreign reserves, has cut most of its holdings in U.S. commercial banks because it fears the banks could fail in an economic recession, prolonged by a Persian Gulf war, central bank officials said.

Then at the third to last paragraph, and I am going to quote:

There is no evidence that Taiwan's attitude is spreading to other Asian economic powerhouses. Indeed, Japan's leading financial daily, the Nihon Keizai Shimbun, reported today that major Japanese banks have decided to funnel \$10 billion to their U.S. branches by the end of January in the event of a gulf war.

But then it goes on to say why:

The amount is twice the normal monthly injection, the newspaper reported, and is based on the assumption that war may make it difficult for banks to raise funds in the U.S. market.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1991]

TAIWAN CUTS HOLDINGS IN U.S. BANKS; \$35 BILLION SHIFTED; RECESSION FEARS CITED

TAIPEI, TAIWAN, January 14.—Taiwan, holder of one of the world's largest foreign reserves, has cut most of its holdings in U.S. commercial banks because it fears the banks could fail in an economic recession prolonged by a Persian Gulf war, central bank officials said today.

According to the officials, who were quoted by the Reuter and Kyodo news services, some of the island nation's reserves have been moved to the U.S. Federal Reserve and some to banks in Europe, Japan and Australia.

"The shift is mainly to protect our reserves as we face more risks by depositing our money in U.S. banks," a senior bank official told reporters.

The move represents a surprising vote of no confidence in the U.S. financial system. U.S. officials and private bank analysts have been virtually unanimous in agreeing that while American banks are facing severe difficulties, the chances of widespread major bank failures are almost nil.

But Central Bank Governor Samuel Shieh told reporters, "The U.S. economy is in more of a shambles than you can understand and war will prolong the recession."

Taiwan's foreign exchange reserves stand at about \$73 billion. About \$35 billion has been moved from U.S. commercial banks since late 1990, the officials said.

They said the central bank now keeps only small amounts of its reserves in major American banks to maintain business relations. They did not provide figures.

There is no evidence that Taiwan's attitude is spreading to other Asian economic powerhouses. Indeed, Japan's leading financial daily, the Nihon Keizai Shimbun, reported today that major Japanese banks have decided to funnel \$10 billion to their

U.S. branches by the end of January in the event of a gulf war.

The amount is twice the normal monthly injection, the newspaper reported, and is based on the assumption that war may make it difficult for banks to raise funds in the U.S. market.

Spokesmen for several major Japanese banks, however, denied the report.

Of course, but does this mean that we have not had a flight of this capital? Of course we have. Does it mean that we have not had some of these creditors and investors, who seeing the value of their investment shrink as the dollar falls, pull it out, and as the interest rates become a little bit more competitive, or at least equal as say in Germany, the money is going to go there, as it has been already.

So given that, plus the disarray in our domestic financial structure, we can see why it is that I consider this to be the most critical of all issues. Yet for 2 years I have been unable to attract any attention, even from members of committees such as the one that I happen to have the honor to chair, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

I have spoken with the highest of our monetary officials. I have spoken, where I have had an opportunity, with three of the private and probably the ones very highly immersed in high international or multinational financing and I ask if they are not concerned about the possibility and the real clear danger and present danger that the dollar can be replaced as the international reserve unit. And they say, after a pause, "Well, maybe at some future time, if the United States experiences a period of protracted instability."

But when I asked, "Well, why can't it happen next year," they cannot tell me why. It is just a feeling that they do not feel it can happen.

But then, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 years ago when I was taking this place and reporting the speculative fever and the financial bubbles that were building up in the real estate markets, and what would be the obvious, the obvious finality of this, I heard the same thing from all of those who were enjoying that merry-go-round. Why? Everybody was making money. Why? Everybody was getting their money out of the S&L that was paying them maybe 6% or 7 percent and putting it in that money market where they could get 8 percent or better, not figuring that maybe it was not insured.

So, who listens? Oh, yes, I read these articles now about how terrible the shambles has been, and what the coming dim, grim prospects of the commercial banking situation are, and these are the experts, the biggest economists. In my service on the Banking Committee for 30 years I have seen eight Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board come before the committee. Not one, not one ever said, "Well, you know, this is what is going on now."

There are some dangers here, and maybe, just maybe something could happen." Never. All the experts from economists to geoeconomic plans experts, they all come, like we say in Spanish, after the storm, like the rainbow. They always show up after the storm. But who was there when there were a few voices, mine among them? I am going to be fair to myself. I do not see the record is here. It is not what I am saying now, in retrospect. It is not hindsight. It is what I have been speaking out about for more than 25 years, so of course I feel intensely. What I am saying now is that no matter what we do domestically we are not beset by external forces over which we no longer have any control, and it is inescapable.

I asked the Chairman before last of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Volcker, in 1987 in the last appearance he made before the committee, before his successor took over, what are we doing, and of course, it means what were we doing in concert with other nations in this vast, daily, huge amount of currency transactions worldwide, every day? Today, as we gathered here, we will have no less than \$675 billion, and that is a very conservative estimate. These are currencies changing currencies.

Anyway, it is not until just lately that because of the IBS, the International Bank for Settlement, international settlement based in Basel, Switzerland, of which we are not a voting member, we are just, as of some 15 years or less been permitted to visit, but we have no real voice or vote. These are the real decisionmakers in this labyrinth known as international finance, which today will determine where we are headed for as far as economic impact and independence, above all independence and freedom.

□ 1310

The fact is that our country and its leaders in both the public as well as the private sector, have little or no historical memory, or have done what, say, the European leaders have done, or the Japanese leaders. That is, anticipate and have not only short-range but long-range use.

The last President to develop any kind of long-range type of approach was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. When any person wants to tell me that all of this that is happening is an act of God, interest rates usurious, exacting, calamitous to any society, were like an act of God. I remember six Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board coming before the committee to say, "Oh, there is nothing we can do about interest rates. Now, you guys, if you do not spend the budget on some of those special programs, why, interest rates will go down." Well, all of a sudden we get the most monstrous public debt, the most monstrous private debt, the most monstrous corporate debt in the

history of mankind. The Federal Reserve Board says, "Well, you know what, maybe we can." This is just 5 or 6 years ago. "Yes, maybe we do have something to do with interest rates."

Now, that is jargon when they start talking about M-1 and the kind of money that is in circulation, and its philosophy, and all that kind of bull. That is jargon. The truth of the matter is that policies, basic policies as to who has the power to allocate credit in a society, interest rates, is a mechanism by virtue of which wealth is transferred within a society. This is why, in the dawn of civilization, in the reign of Hammurabi—incidentally, if he were alive today he would be an Iraqi, because it was out of Mesopotamia which is where Iraq is that we got all of this. If we look at the Code of Hammurabi, and here is an individual reigning 7,000 years before Christ, we will see interest as usurious and punishable by death. All through history, one way or another, we had some measure of control. We have not had. Some other countries do, but why could Franklin Roosevelt, which is the answer I give to those who say, "Wait a while, nothing you can do. What can you-all do?" I say it is not what we can do, it is what our country wants its sovereign power, who are the people. That is the sovereign power in our country.

The first words of our Constitution say that. They do not say, "We the Congress," or, "I the President." They say, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union," et cetera. That is where our power comes from. We have gotten away from that. We have created these entities that say, "We are independent. Why, you politicians better not mess around with us," forgetting that it was the Congress that created them. Yes, they are independent. They are known as Federal, but only in name. They are really not Federal agencies. They are not amenable to accountability to the Congress, and up to now, other than through appointment, they have not been much amendable to Presidents.

How could President Franklin Roosevelt, utilizing in a time of war, world war, 46½ percent of the total gross national product in that effort to wage and win the war on the Federal level, how could he have the Government never pay more than 2 percent interest? Well, there is a story behind it. I will not go into it now, other than to show how, when we have accountable leadership, when we had tremendous power, but as always, fundamental in our Constitution, all power shall have accountability. However, when we do not have accountability, we know where we are now and where we are headed.

We can bash others, like the Japanese and whatnot. However, I do not think that is proper. I will tell Members why. Why were banks in our banks

chartered? They were chartered for public need and convenience. Well, today, Members who think that they were chartered and were guaranteed by law and by the Government to make profit, not to public need or convenience. That is the basic law in our country. It has been from the beginning. However, banks have the power to create money. Do Members think the Government prints money? Look at your dollar bill. It no longer says "U.S. Treasury," it says "Federal Reserve Note." What is the Federal Reserve? It is not a Federal agency. It is a creature of the private commercial bank. So they are the ones, if anyone prints it, it is the Federal Reserve Board. However, banks create money because they create allocation of credit. Why is it that we have had thousands of banks fail? Just in the last few years, but in the 20th century, and in Great Britain they have not had one large bank fail in 100 years. Why? Well, there are reasons, but what I am leading up to now is what I see as a most present, the most clear, and the most ominous of all dangers. That is that all of this horrendous debt structure that we have piled will have to be paid back in somebody else's currency, once the dollar is replaced as the international reserve unit. No person yet, neither these high and supposedly knowledgeable bankers, or the highest monetary officials of our country, can tell me why, even before there is a European monetary system, and has decided to nationalize the ECU, which is the European currency unit. Even before then. Why cannot the Group of Seven, or the Group of Ten, get together, England or no England, and decide that they are going to poll their international reserves and nationalize the ECU? That is it for the dollar.

What does that mean? Like I say and repeat, it means that our privilege, and we are the only Nation whose people can say we pay our debts in our currency, will be paying this monstrous debt, the corporate debt equals the governmental debt, the governmental debt is way up there if we include the off-budget items. We have better than 6½ trillion. The private debt, just you and I, we built it up. It means we would have to pay that back in somebody else's currency, most likely the ECU.

□ 1320

The ECU right now is worth about \$1.30.

Now, what is the more practical, commercial, business and economic impact? Well, I sat on the committee that has had its jurisdiction on every single so-called bailout that has come across the Congress since the 1970's. We first had the Penn Central. I was in on that. We had New York City. We had the Lockheed bailout and then we had Chrysler.

Why? Because it was obvious to me then and, mind you, first in the 1970's or late 1960's was the first time I was saying that our capital, our credit allocations, were not going into the needs of commerce to stoke and fire the engines of commerce and production. They were going somewhere else, unlike Japan. Japan to this day, the bankers invest in their own production, they have a line of credit.

Let me read to you from an interview in a very, very competent publication known as the "Financier, the Journal of Private Sector Policy," with one of our I think industrial geniuses, Henry B. Schacht. It is an interview in this magazine with the chairman of Cummins Engine. He tells you that Cummins Engine, faced with the Japanese, is the only manufacturer of this type of heavy machines, heavy-duty truck motors, that has been able to withstand the Japanese competition, but it has had to pay the price of not making much of a profit.

What is his biggest need? Capital.

I am going to quote from his interview:

The issue before the country is whether we are going to have a system that provides capital to the investing side of our physical, goods-producing sector, or whether we are going to be inadvertently forced into short-term investing—

Which is what we have now—

which is what I think is happening.

So what you get is under-investment in capital and under-investment in new technology, and competitive erosion.

He said it all. This is what in my speeches before my colleagues, going back to the sixties, has been about because I feel it is a responsibility of mine. I have been privileged to serve on this committee from the first day that I was sworn in to the Congress in 1961. I am very privileged and I feel being charged with knowledge, the least I can do is report, and what I am reporting is troubling, I know. I know everybody thinks that the biggest No. 1 problem is the Middle East these other things.

Let me assure my comrades and colleagues, the dimensions of this lesser noticed and appreciated problem are of such a magnitude that they can, more than loss of a war, doom us to economic and financial dependence.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAHALL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS of Utah, for 60 minutes, on January 29.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes, each day on January 29, 30, and 31.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, each day on January 31 and February 4.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes, each day on February 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRETT) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in two instances.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in seven instances.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAHALL) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. STENHOLM.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mrs. BOXER.

Mr. DURBIN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 29, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

478. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Follow-up Audit on Contracts Between the Department of Human Services and Metropolitan Health Associates, Inc.," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

479. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting a notice of final funding priorities for certain new direct grant programs in the Office of Special Edu-

cation Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

480. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a compilation and analysis of State activities in implementing the second year of the Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Challenge Grant Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5116a(1), 5116g; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

481. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report for 1990 on compliance by States with personnel standards for radiologic technicians, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1006(d); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

482. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Justice, transmitting notification of the implementation of recommendations in the Department's Environmental and Natural Resources Division Superfund financial activities report for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Melissa Foelsch Wells, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zaire, and members of her family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

484. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on the development assistance program allocations for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to Public Law 101-513; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the allocation of funds made available for foreign military financing, international military education and training, peacekeeping operations, and economic support fund assistance, pursuant to Public Law 101-513; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

486. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

487. A letter from the Executive Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

488. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase for the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

489. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner, Delaware River Basin Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

490. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report on the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act for the year ending September 30, 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3810; to the Committee on Government Operations.

491. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report

on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

493. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Assistance Board, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

494. A letter from the Board of Directors, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

495. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

496. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

497. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

498. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of their Audit Report Register, including all financial recommendations, for the 6-month period ending September 30, 1990; to the Committee on Government Operations.

499. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

500. A letter from the Executive Director, Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

501. A letter from the Director, Institute of Museum Services, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

502. A letter from the Executive Director, Interagency Council on the Homeless, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

503. A letter from the Executive Director, Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

504. A letter from the President, National Endowment for Democracy, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

505. A letter from the Director, National Gallery of Art, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

507. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

508. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

509. A letter from the President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

510. A letter from the Chairman, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

511. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

512. A letter from the Chairman, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

513. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

514. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

515. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

516. A letter from the Executive Director, State Justice Institute, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

517. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner, Susquehanna River Basin Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

518. A letter from the Chairperson, the Martin Luther King Federal Holiday Commission, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

519. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Program, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

520. A letter from the Executive Director, U.S. Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

521. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

522. A letter from the Governor, U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, transmitting a report on the status of audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

523. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an approved loan application from the Tohono O'odham Nation for the Schuk Toak District, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 422d; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

524. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a soil conservation service plan for the South Fork of Little River Watershed, KY; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

525. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting

the fourth annual report on the status of the Radon Mitigation Demonstration Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7401 note; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. BROWDER):

H.R. 656. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research program to ensure continued United States leadership in high-performance computing; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 657. A bill to establish a Commission on Energy Independence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BYRON:

H.R. 658. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow Federal employees to take time off from duty to serve as bone marrow donors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 659. A bill to promote the greater use of recycled paper by mailers of third-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 660. A bill to extend the statute of limitations applicable to any criminal offense which was committed by an officer or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development between 1981 and 1988 and which was related to activities of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 661. A bill to provide special benefits for the Andean nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 662. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to display the flag of the United States of America at the apex of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for dividends paid by domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 664. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.R. 665. A bill to provide for the implementation of the foreign assistance provisions of the enterprise for the Americas Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCURDY:

H.R. 666. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the amount of foreign duty pay, to expand eligibility for such pay, and to standardize the payment of such pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROE, Ms. LONG, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SHARP, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WISE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. MRAZEK):

H.R. 667. A bill to authorize a grant to the national writing project; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. PENNY):

H.R. 668. A bill to allow a deduction for the amount of the premiums paid on a life insurance contract the beneficiary of which is a trust established for the benefit of a disabled individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 669. A bill to control the transfer of arms to countries that threaten world peace, including countries that are the subject of a U.N. or U.S. blockade or embargo; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Ways and Means; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Agriculture.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 670. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide greater disclosure to consumers of information concerning consumers by creditors, credit reporting agencies, and other users of credit information, prevent abuses with regard to such information, to increase the enforcement authority of Federal regulatory agencies with responsibility to enforce the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 671. A bill to limit injunctive relief, and prohibit the award of costs (including attorney's fees) against a judicial officer for action taken in a judicial capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 672. A bill to prohibit certain waiver of liability provisions in NASA contracts, and to prohibit the exclusion of NASA quality assurance personnel from contractor work sites except as provided in the contract; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York (for herself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the treatment of qualified small issue bonds through 1996; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 674. A bill to provide health benefits for Reserve members who are called to active duty in connection with Operation Desert Storm, and their dependents, upon termination of their service on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 675. A bill to provide transitional health benefits for Reserve members who are called or ordered to active duty in connection with Operation Desert Storm, and their dependents, upon termination of their service on active duty, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WISE (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. YATES, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms.

KAPTUR, Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. MINK, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WILSON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 676. A bill to require that the U.S. Postal Service rescind changes recently implemented relating to standards for the delivery of mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLPE (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to extend indefinitely the current provisions governing the export of certain domestically produced crude oil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the imposition of additional import duties by the President to ensure that wealthy foreign countries that benefit from the United States efforts to compel the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait equitably share the cost of those efforts; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the number of consecutive terms Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives may serve, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution concerning the Nobel Peace Prize awarded to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a White House conference regarding solid waste disposal and reduction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OAKAR (for herself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WISE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should prepare and submit before April 1, 1991, a proposed national energy policy plan which includes specific energy objectives for the year 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H. Res. 46. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide certain qualifications pertaining to service as a Member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 102: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr.

SANDERS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 103: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. RAY, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 104: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. SPENCE, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 105: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 112: Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ALLARD, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 177: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 178: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 179: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 258: Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 262: Mr. SMITH of Florida and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 263: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 371: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 451: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ROE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WISE, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 480: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 537: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LENT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 542: Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 550: Mr. STARK, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 553: Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 555: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 556: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 559: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 639: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WILSON.

H.J. Res. 73: Mr. SEXTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HARRIS,

Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H. Res. 19: Mr. ECKART and Mr. STOKES.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Seattle, WA, relative to its opposition to the impending war in the Middle East; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. RAY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. PETRI. Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr.